

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/519,741	BRUMBOIU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LaToya I. Cross	1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) LaToya I. Cross.

(3) _____.

(2) Roseann Caldwell.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 May 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Atty. Caldwell faxed a draft claim proposal to attempt to overcome the rejections given in the Final Office Action dated 4-22-04. The 112, 1st paragraph issues are overcome with the proposed response. Atty. Caldwell provided arguments that none of the prior art cited teaches or suggest determining the a mathematical function that represents measured concentration of a gas in a liquid versus actual concentration of a gas in a liquid when the gas is at the concentratoin in the liquid above the solubility threshold. Further, none of the cited prior art teach or suggest obtaining a correction factor for measuring the concentration of a gas in a liquid.